ISBN 088799-213-7

Council of Ontario Universities

review
1982-83 to 1985-86

Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario

BOTTOMING OUT

130 St. George Street, Suite 8039, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2T4
86-6

Contents

1. Into the Eighties/1

A Deficits Legislation/2

B Continuing Underfunding/3

C Another Commission/4

D A New Government/5

2. Undergraduate Students: Aspirations and Realities/7

A Continuing Enrolment Increases/7

B The Accessibility Issue/8

C Fees/9

D Improved Information to Applicants/10

E Enrolment Projections/11

F Renewal in the Secondary Schools/12

G Graduates and the Labour Market/13

H Visa Students/14

3. Graduate Students and Faculty, Careers and Research/15

A Graduate Enrolment/15

B The Faculty Profile/16

C Faculty Renewal/17

D Tenure/17

E Mandatory Retirement/17

F Salaries/18

G Graduate Programme Appraisal/18

H Research/19

I The Private Sector/21

Contents (Continued)

4. Inside and Outside: Collective Ventures and Public Perceptions/22

A Distance Education/22

B Interuniversity Athletics/23

C Status of Women/23

D Health Sciences/23

E French Language Centre/24

F Other Collective Activities/24

G National Universities' Week/24

H The Public Image/25

5. Conclusion: Light on the Horizon/27

Appendices

A Members, Executive, Secretariat/28

B Constitution/30

C Committees, Boards, Affiliates/33

D Financial Statements/42

E Publications/45

Chapter 1

Into the Eighties

The universities of Ontario entered the 1980s cautiously optimistic that the financial ills and other chronic uncertainties that had plagued them during the preceding decade would be effectively addressed by the government. This optimism was based on the contents of the final report of the Committee on the Future Role of Universities in Ontario (CFRUO). They were disappointed.

The Committee had been asked to review the current objectives of the universities in operational terms; to judge how well these objectives were being met; how the cost of meeting them was related to funding levels; how the funding mechanism might be modified and, finally, what the appropriate joint roles were for the individual institutions, the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), the Ontario Council on University Affairs (OCUA), and the Government of Ontario. In its report the Committee recommended that the validity of the traditional objectives for the universities be reaffirmed. It went on to recommend that to meet these objectives successfully, public funding for the universities should be increased substantially. It proposed no fundamental change in the existing relations between the universities and the province and no significant change in the allocative mechanism for government grants.

However, in its final chapter, "The Alternative: A Restructured System", the Committee took a bold step. It offered the judgment that unless the universities were given a higher priority by government, the pattern of projected funding would be inadequate to enable the universities to maintain quality in their programmes. Should the government be unable or unwilling to provide increased funding, the Committee recommended that it undertake a radical scaling-down and reorganization of the university system in Ontario. A third course, against which the Committee strongly warned, was 'muddling through', maintaining the same objectives without any increase in financial resources.

The Committee provided the government with two alternatives, one preferred, the other less preferred. The preferred path was an increase in funding sufficient to enable the universities to maintain quality at their current level of operations; the less preferred, much more drastic path was a major reduction in the scale of operations sufficient to maintain quality at the level of financial support provided. The Committee recognized clearly that going this latter route would reduce accessibility in both geographic and programme terms and that it would adversely affect the breadth of university research. However, it judged such retrenchment preferable to any further loss in quality.

The Report was given a generally favourable reception within the university community. It was also favourably received by the media, which predictably focused attention on the drastic restructuring alternative — regarded by many simply as a stalking horse intended to draw attention to the pressing need for increased public funding. The government was quick to react to suggestions that accessibility should be reduced and some institutions closed in a scaled-down system by reasserting its commitment to the current policy on accessibility and to the present number of institutions. This cost nothing. But it did not take any steps to alleviate the deteriorating financial situation of the universities or to advance public policy in this area. The government simply cited the generally strained economic climate and uncertainties surrounding continuing federal financial support for post-secondary education. When the global operating grants to universities were announced in early 1982 it became clear that the government had decided not to act on the major recommendations in the Report. It had opted for 'muddling through'.

The work of the Committee receded quickly over the temporal horizon. The sense of vacuum in the sphere of public policy for the universities was intensified. This led inevitably to greater frustration, loss of morale and apathy within the university community. Yet university operations did not grind to a halt. Application and enrolment trends continued to display unexpected buoyancy, belying the government's apparent assumption that demographic forces would alleviate pressure on the university system and provide a natural solution to funding problems. University research expanded and a clearer public perception of the value of research grew. The government initiated a thorough review of the secondary school curriculum with the publication of the policy document, "Ontario Schools: Intermediate and Senior" (OSIS).

Deficits Legislation

As a consequence of the continuing financial pressures a number of universities began to run deficits on their annual operating budgets. This soon attracted the attention of the Minister. Early in 1982, noting that the government was not prepared to provide special funds to cover operating deficits, she requested advice from OCUA on what action should be taken to prevent and to eliminate 'unmanageable deficits'. In response that Council advised the government to introduce legislation that would enable government to place under trusteeship any university which ran an accumulated deficit in excess of 2% of its annual operating budget and which, after examination, was judged unlikely to be able to handle a deficit of that size. The government quickly accepted this advice and introduced Bill 42, An Act to Amend the Colleges and Universities Act. Similar legislation already existed in other provinces. Nevertheless, Ontario universities strenuously opposed the bill on the grounds that it would reduce the flexibility that had enabled them successfully thus far to operate in a climate of severe fiscal restraint. This stand was supported by the two opposition parties in the legislature and they succeeded in blocking passage of the bill. Eventually it died on the order paper. The government none the less attained its principal objective, since boards of governors and the incidence of year-end deficits diminished sharply.

Continuing Underfunding

By 1982 it had been many years since the government had provided the universities with a level of operating support they and OCUA judged necessary. As a consequence, any calculation of the amount of increased funding required to make up the accumulated shortfall produced a sum that lacked both relevance and credibility. While such exercises had historical interest and were continued by COU for the record, they had long since ceased to have any positive impact on government. During the years under review, therefore, COU adopted a pragmatic approach in preparing its annual brief to OCUA on the financial needs of the universities for the coming academic year. In the most finished and starkly realistic form these briefs consisted of an assessment of what level of increase would be required to enable the universities to maintain the same level of activities as the previous year. The focus was on preventing further deterioration, without mention of 'catch-up' needs. These claims were buttressed by the presentation of intersectoral and interprovincial comparisons, e.g., Ontario grants per elementary and secondary school student, per hospital patient day and other provinces' grants per FTE student. All showed clearly the continuing decline of Ontario universities in government spending priorities. In 1983-84 and 1984-85, for example, Ontario ranked ninth among the provinces in Canada in its per student expenditure on universities; and by 1985 the percentage of Ontario budgetary expenditures on universities had fallen to 5.1% from 6.6% in 1972-73.

The overpowering irony of the annual COU briefs was their clearly inadequate starting point, the insufficient amount provided by the previous year's grant. When, as it was, this advice was funnelled through the government's advisory body, OCUA, Council's views were robbed of their immediacy. While OCUA's own advice was largely supportive of the universities' case, the continuing failure of government to accept it meant that that Council served increasingly as a buffer protecting government from the demands of the universities.

During this period a series of revisions were made to the operating grants formula. Intended to make it less sensitive to fluctuations in enrolment, they served only to exacerbate the situation. Those universities which did not increase enrolment saw their share of the global grant decrease; those universities which increased enrolment saw their new students receiving discounted dollars. Almost resigned to the fact that the size of the grant pie would not be increased, the universities were now at daggers drawn over how it should be cut up.

In this period as well government grants in aid of capital and research projects fell far short of the universities' requirements. Further, capital grants continued to be awarded on the basis of government discretion. As a result, few new capital projects were funded and those that were tended to be ones with high local visibility. The Board for Industrial Leadership and Development (BILD) continued to provide a modicum of financial support for university research and over time this evolved into the University Research Incentive Fund (URIF), a programme of matching grants in which the government provided one dollar for every two supplied from the private sector. Conceived at the same time as BILD, the IDEA Corporation failed to

live up to expectations and never served as a true bridge between university research and commercialization.

Another Commission

Dominated by the intractable question of funding, university/government relations were at an impasse in 1983. Informal discussions with the Minister continued to be held periodically; an attempt to improve the operating grants formula had failed. On the last day of legislative sitting before Christmas the Minister rose in her seat to announce the creation of yet another commission, The Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario. This Commission was asked:

> To present to the government a plan of action to better enable the universities of Ontario to adjust to changing social and economic conditions. The Commission should proceed on the basis that annual increases to the real public resources provided to the universities will reflect the desire to protect the integrity of the universities, to strengthen their ability to contribute to the intellectual, economic, social and cultural foundation of society, as well as to reflect the government's policy of fiscal restraint and prudent management of public funds.

Faculty and student groups were very critical of the move, seeing, in the rhetoric of the Minister's statement that no additional funds would be forthcoming, a signal that the operational plan the government was calling for from the Commission was a screen for an already conceived government blueprint for a restructured university system. Other university representatives, including COU, were prepared to give the Commission a chance.

The Commission was formally established on 20 January 1984. A retired business executive, Edmund Bovey, was named chairman; the other two commissioners were Dr. J. Fraser Mustard and Dr. Ronald L. Watts, both well known and respected in the Ontario university community. It set to work with a will. A preliminary report in the form of a discussion paper was issued in June. Entitled *Ontario Universities 1984: Issues and Alternatives*, it focused on four major concerns: quality, accessibility, adaptability and differentiation. The Commission invited comments and announced an extensive series of public hearings in university cities across the province for the fall.

This summary cannot do justice to the many briefs submitted to the Commission. Their number, volume and seriousness surprised many, given the apparent apathy on the question of a redefinition of government policy in the wake of the government's failure to act on the earlier Commission's report. In many cases universities received strong local community support at the hearings, a fact which lent important credence to their regional roles. Most universities responded to the challenge implicit in the term 'differentiation' and documented their distinctiveness, something they had achieved without the imposition of a government-designed master plan. By the time the hearings were held, the earlier critics of the process, impressed by the seriousness with which the Commission was undertaking its work, muted their criticisms and participated through the presentation of briefs and close monitoring of the hearings.

The final report of the Commission, *Ontario Universities: Options and Futures*, was submitted to the government in December 1984, less than a year after the inception of its work. In the Report the Commission maintained its earlier four-part focus, but to the surprise of many moved boldly into the sphere of finances, while still respecting the premise implicit in its terms of reference that no substantial modifications would be made to the volume of basic operating funding. The Commission proposed imaginative solutions to many of the chronic ills of the universities and the interested reader is referred to the Report for its very comprehensive treatment. Public perceptions, guided by the response of interest groups and the media, however, tended to restrict attention to the short- and middle-term measures that were being proposed to restore health to the universities.

Attention was focused sharply in two areas: recommendations for a temporary reduction in accessibility, and for increased tuition fees. Judged in isolation, these proposals were summarily rejected by student and faculty associations, by media commentators, and by the government — in fact, by everyone except university administrators, who perhaps reluctantly accepted the possibly valuable transitional role such otherwise unpopular measures might have. This public response, plus the perception that the Report was composed of a complex set of interdependent recommendations, some of which did not appear to be solidly grounded in fact, seriously jeopardized the Report. Certainly, the lack of government response — other than the rejection of lowered accessibility and higher tuition fees — to the Report it had so imaginatively commissioned a year earlier doomed the document to a place on the shelf already holding that of the Fisher Committee Report (CFRUO, 1981) and that of the Parrott Commission on the universities of north-eastern Ontario (1982). Again, the question was raised: what kind of advice was politically acceptable?

A New Government

A provincial election in the Spring of 1985 brought to an end the long period of Conservative rule in Ontario and saw the formation of a minority Liberal government. Although university issues did not become a major campaign issue, the campaigning Liberals, while distancing themselves from the politically highly sensitive issues of reduced accessibility and increased tuition fees, were strongly critical of their Conservative opponents for underfunding Ontario universities, and made commitments to change this situation. As a result, university expectations of some financial relief were raised. The first step came early in the tenure of office of the new government in mid-October with the announcement of a $50 million University Excellence Fund. Comprising three components, its objectives were clearly derived from the findings and recommendations of the Bovey Commission: improvement of quality in undergraduate instruction, support for excellence in research, and renewal of the professoriate. Initially for one year only, 1986-87, the faculty renewal component of the Fund was subsequently extended. In the Spring of 1986, the government announced a five-year faculty renewal programme to fund 500 faculty positions.

The enthusiasm of the universities for the Excellence Fund was quickly muted, however, when the Treasurer announced in his first budget later the following week

that university operating grant increases would be 4% in 1986-87 and 4% in 1987-88. To the universities this seemed too much like giving with the one hand while taking away with the other. They were being provided with targeted funds to be used for good purposes, but the level of base operating support was less than that required to maintain their operations at current levels.

Later in the fall, as part of its thrust to improve Ontario's competitive position through increased support for research and for research and development, the government established a special committee chaired by the new Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities to report on how to improve the universities' ability to contribute to this task. The Committee reported early in February 1986, but to date the report has not been published. In the Spring 1986 Speech from the Throne the government announced a major initiative in the areas of technology and entrepreneurship to assist the province in meeting new competitive challenges. A Premier's Council was established to provide policy advice in this area. One billion dollars were committed over a ten-year period to fuel the decided-upon initiatives. First items of business for the new Council are to be the establishment of university chairs in designated areas and the active consideration of how best to foster centres of excellence in research in Ontario universities. While these announcements hold prospects for increased funding to universities, the extent of the funding and the details of administration remain to be worked out. It is clear, however, that these will be targeted funds. While welcoming such initiatives, the universities' continuing concern is with the inadequate level of base funding support. The government is prepared to provide greater funds to the universities for certain specific purposes related to its socio-economic goals; however, it seems unprepared to provide an adequate level of base support. The university community has yet to convince the government that excellence in research, or in any other significant university activity, cannot be built on a weak base.

Underlying the entire discussion is the question of quality, particularly the quality of the educational experience being afforded the students who register at Ontario universities. Student evaluations of quality are notoriously difficult as the students themselves have, at best, a sliding scale of reference, moving from lower to upper years and to new courses and instructional environments. University administrators relate quality to overall levels of revenue and more specifically to levels of government funding, but generally have been reluctant to attempt the documentation of a possible decline in the quality of undergraduate education, as individual 'horror stories' could all too easily be ascribed to institutional mismanagement on the faculty or departmental level. In the late Winter of 1986, however, members of COU went on a 'fact-finding' tour of the universities as part of a stepped-up campaign to impress the public and the government with the need to increase funding for universities. During this tour many graphic examples of the effects of underfunding were provided. At the general level Council has always held that quality is irrevocably tied to funding and that both have implications for accessibility.

Chapter 2

Undergraduate Students: Aspirations and Realities

Despite the increasing number of limitations placed on enrolment by the universities themselves as they wrestled with the constraining effects of underfunding, overall enrolment has continued to increase, albeit slowly, during the period under review. The significance of these developments, indeed their meaning, in terms of accessibility is not easy to determine.

Continuing Enrolment Increases

In the period 1982-83 to 1985-86 both applications for admission to university and resulting enrolments grew by modest but significant amounts, a growth which slightly outpaced Grade XIII enrolment figures. Increases in numbers of applicants coming directly from Grade XIII of 5.1% in 1982 and 7.3% in 1983 levelled out in 1984 when a total of 72,216 students applied, 1% higher than the previous year. The number dropped slightly in 1985 to 70,937. Some 30,700 of these subsequently registered in first year, along with 7,743 students from other immediate backgrounds. Non-Canadians who came to study in Canada on student visas made up an important subset of these numbers, although at the peak visa students never accounted for more than 10% of first-year students. As a result of substantially increased tuition fees for visa students introduced in 1983, enrolment of these students has declined sharply. Behind these apparently straightforward statistics on undergraduate applications, offers, and enrolment lie a number of complex factors which are very difficult to quantify, much less to assess.

Demographers had accurately predicted a decline in elementary and secondary school enrolments in the 1980s as the post-World War II baby boom was followed by a bust. When the first signs of this development became evident through closed schools and reduced teacher complements, concerned professionals made efforts to incorporate this demography in projections of future university enrolment. Their projections combined with a temporary dip in registrations in 1979 to generate a widespread assumption of declining university enrolments. With this assumption it became relatively easy for government planners to justify restraint in university funding. According to one scenario that became popular in these circles, the university system had been 'overbuilt' in the 1960s and early 70s. Now with declining enrolment it contained large numbers of under-worked but still job-guaranteed (tenured) faculty. Although far from the reality, this perception has proved extremely difficult to correct.

The reality is that in the period under review, although Grade XIII enrolments have stabilized, the proportion of Grade XIII matriculants going on to university has increased. The participation rate of Ontario residents in the traditional university-entrance age group who are enrolled in university has climbed to about 17%. At the same time, the number of mature students attending university in Ontario has also increased dramatically, though starting from a much smaller base. One of the most significant factors in this impressive growth is the sharp increase in the number of females attending university, although this increase is unevenly distributed by programme. This is a record of which all Ontario citizens can be proud, but it is still a mixed one.

The Accessibility Issue

As a backdrop to the annual data on enrolment, the debate on accessibility has continued, stimulated by the publication of such studies as Paul Anisef's *The Pursuit of Equality: Evaluating and Monitoring Accessibility to Post-Secondary Education in Ontario* (1982). Anisef's name became a rallying cry for student organizations calling for greater accessibility to the post-secondary education system. It is generally recognized that young people of certain socio-economic backgrounds are under-represented at universities. Student leaders singled out rising tuition fees and perceived inadequacies in the student assistance plans as the major obstacle, and called for a freeze of the former, to be followed by gradual move to their elimination. Others, including the government, saw the obstacle farther upstream, in the form of pervasive and deep-seated attitudes toward higher education among the poorly represented groups, attitudes which in effect curtailed their ambitions in the direction of higher education. Nothing has been done, however, by any of the parties to mount a public education campaign to increase the participation rate of the under-represented strata of Ontario society. The government's unconscious desire would seem to have been that the university system prove expansive enough to accommodate all who qualified and had the ambition to apply without, however, any injection of new funds. While community outreach had begun to play a larger role in the universities' self-defined missions, an information campaign emphasizing opportunities for new groups of prospective applicants could not conscionably be undertaken at the same time as other students were being turned away.

Within the universities, the situation became extremely complex. As a result of changing student preferences, pressure for places in some academic programmes such as commerce, computer science and engineering increased substantially. While the universities did expand these programmes, their response was not proportionate to the increased demand. As a result, the number of undergraduate programmes with limited enrolment — enrolment below the number of qualified applicants — increased. The baneful effects of underfunding gradually forced more and more universities to place limits on the number of students they were prepared to admit.

Relatively long lead time is required to establish new academic programmes or to expand existing ones. When additional faculty and physical space are required,

substantial additional financial resources must be secured. More students could always be crowded into existing classrooms, and in some cases they were, but at the cost of reduced access to the instructor, both inside and outside the classroom, more limited availability of laboratory equipment, and sharper competition among students for access to library materials. In their efforts to meet these altered student interests, the universities maintained their efforts to make the quality of education their prime concern. As their financial circumstances worsened, eventually enrolment limits were imposed on more and more programmes. Ironically, at a time when government, business, students and the public were expecting a flexible, forward-looking response from the universities to these new demands, the universities were least able to comply.

Fees

Tuition fees are controlled by the government through the operating grants formula. In the period under review increases in tuition fees have followed the annual rate of increase in the global operating grant plus an additional discretionary amount of up to 10% of the formula fee. By and large all institutions have chosen to exercise this discretion. In May 1982, citing a number of examples of recent or proposed increases in ancillary fees which were not included in the limit of the formula fee plus 10%, the Minister requested advice on ancillary fees from OCUA.

After review, OCUA concluded that it would not be appropriate for government to impose policy restraints in this area but that the situation warranted careful monitoring. At the same time, that Council recommended that all compulsory ancillary fees should be eligible for support under OSAP. The Minister accepted this advice but asked OCUA to proceed immediately to establish a data collection and monitoring system. She also requested Council to work toward the determination of an identifiable point at which ancillary fees could be judged to have reached an 'unreasonable' level. Again in 1983. OCUA recommended that no action be taken. The Minister accepted this advice but once again expressed concern that compulsory ancillary fees were having an adverse effect on accessibility and, as well, causing students in the same academic programmes in different universities to be facing dramatically different ancillary fees.

OCUA issued a third advisory memorandum in February 1986 reporting on the most recent findings resulting from its monitoring and recommending a new approach to ancillary fees. It recommended that non-tuition-related ancillary fees should continue to be classified as ancillary fees but that all other fees should be classified as tuition fees. This would put academic programme-related fees in the same category as tuition fees and tie them to the formula fee. Accordingly, OCUA conjoined a second recommendation, that effective 1986-87 institutions should be given an additional 5% discretion in setting tuition fees, being permitted to set actual tuition fees up to a maximum of 115% of formula fees without incurring a reduction in government grants. The Minister accepted this advice but postponed implementation of the new policy until 1 May 1987. At that time all tuition-related ancillary fees will be eligible for inclusion in the category of tuition fee, and the discretionary tuition

fee will be permitted to increase by an amount yet to be determined but not above 5% of the formula fee.

Improved Information to Applicants

For many years general information on the nature of various Ontario universities and their academic programmes has been made available each autumn to secondary school students through the Ontario Universities' Information Programme. Typically, this involves a tour of the major centres of the province by representative teams from the universities who hold information sessions with upper-year secondary school students and guidance counsellors. These visits are supplemented by information published by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and collectively by the universities themselves and circulated to the schools. The universities publication, *INFO*, provides up-to-date information on new courses and programmes, changes in admissions requirements, residential facilities, and so on. Given the increase in the number of limited enrolment programmes in recent years this publication has also provided information on the number of places available in such programmes, on the number of applicants to them in the previous year, and on the minimum grade average (usually expressed as a range) required for admission to the programme in the year previous.

With the more detailed information available to prospective university applicants, secondary school students are now making more informed choices. As a result, a degree of self-selection seems to be operating, with some students whose grades may not be competitive not applying to programmes such as engineering, business and computer science, where space is limited. Nevertheless, enrolment in these programmes is at an all-time high.

Most Ontario universities have now reached capacity in all undergraduate programmes. As a result, entrance requirements have risen in all programmes and in some instances the competition for first-year places has increased sharply. This in turn has resulted in some displacement of students, in both geographic and programme terms, when they are unable to obtain offers from institutions and in programmes of their first choice. It can be argued that the objectives of the traditional policy of accessibility continue to be served: there would be a place at an Ontario university for all qualified applicants (interpreted as those who have obtained a minimum average of 60% on six Grade XIII subjects), but not necessarily at the university or in the programme of their choice. Clearly, however, there has been some effective reduction in choice, and students who might earlier have been admitted to some programmes or some institutions are no longer able to register because they do not meet the raised admission requirements.

Concerned with questions of how well system capacity matched applicant numbers, and prompted by institutional, then media, reports of large numbers of applicants being 'turned away', in the Fall of 1983 Council undertook a survey of all qualified students who had applied for admission through the Ontario Universities' Application Centre but did not register at an Ontario university for the fall term. Special attention was paid to those who failed to receive an offer. The results of the survey showed

that, while some applicants received offers to universities or programmes other than their initial choices and were unwilling or unable to accept them, only a small percentage of qualified applicants (less than 3% of the total) failed to receive any offer. Moreover, had the full resources of the Application Centre been exploited by these applicants, this number no doubt would have been reduced. One noteworthy result of the survey was the discovery that a large proportion of the applicants who did not register at an Ontario university were still in school, either at a community college, a university outside Ontario, or back in Grade XIII. Less than 10% of the group was unemployed. Council repeated the survey on the Fall 1984 applicant pool with similar results.

In July 1984 the Application Centre took a further step to improve applicants' opportunities of obtaining a university place by instituting a 'hot line' to provide up-to-date information on which programmes and which universities were still accepting students. This produced a flurry of activity in the first few weeks following the initial set of offers made by the universities. Over the remainder of the summer there were only occasional calls. These results suggested that, while the Ontario university system as a whole was close to capacity, the great majority of qualified applicants was being accommodated. A repetition of the service in the Summer of 1985 showed similar results, despite a further slight tightening up of admission requirements to programmes in high demand and in institutions where enrolments had stabilized.

Behind these facts, however, the issue of accessibility remains intractible. While student demand can be measured at the secondary school-leaving gate, it is very difficult, indeed impossible, to measure accurately the attitudes and aspirations of secondary school students. Many influences shape their attitudes and ambitions vis-à-vis university: parental and peer opinion, teachers' abilities to generate enthusiasm for specific subjects, the extent and quality of guidance counselling, the conditions and rewards (real and perceived) of certain careers, and so on. In the final practical analysis student performance in Grade XIII remains the pass-key to university studies. In the minds of the individual students, however, the question is: Which university programme doors will it open?

Enrolment Projections

Current undergraduate enrolment projections are for a relatively stable enrolment. The demographers' projections are still with us, and little can be done to affect the birth rate of 1968. While the participation rate of the traditional student-age population may inch up somewhat, no radical change is foreseen. The numbers of adult learners choosing to pursue university studies may increase, again perhaps only marginally, since large numbers of those so interested may already have been 'skimmed off' as these possibilities became available. Similarly, while part-time studies have become more widely accessible, both geographically and in terms of programmes offered and scheduling of courses, taking advantage of such opportunities is inexorably tied to fluctuations in the labour market, although in ways difficult to predict. Some students will undertake full- or part-time studies in order to gain a competitive edge

on a tight labour market; others may require a more expansive market permitting them full- or part-time employment in order to finance their studies. Although many observers of the university scene predicted that part-time studies would be a growth area in the 1980s, annual enrolment figures have kept close to the 85,000 mark during the four years under review. These projections, however, could be altered by changes that are being introduced in the Ontario secondary school curriculum.

Renewal in the Secondary Schools

Some concern has been expressed over the potential enrolment consequences of one of the provisions of the OSIS policy cited in Chapter 1, the possibility that secondary schooling might be completed in four years. When the possibility of compressing five years of secondary school into four was first announced, university administrators raised the cry — largely in the wilderness, since few others seemed concerned — that this might result in a 'double cohort' of applicants to university in a given year: one half, the graduates of the traditional programme, the other, the first generation of 'fast-trackers'.

Despite this concern, COU was generally supportive of the OSIS proposals. The recognition of possible future application pressure, plus the desire to involve universities positively in the reform of secondary school curricula, led in 1983 to a decision by Council to appoint a COU/OSIS liaison officer. This decision has proven to have been a very wise one. It has raised the universities' profile in this area, signalling that the universities are interested in education at the secondary level and are prepared to dedicate resources to the task of curricular reform. The move has been very positively received by secondary school administrators, teachers, and officials in the Ministry of Education. More particularly, the activities of the OSIS liaison officer have assisted substantially in bringing university expertise to bear on the development of the new Ontario Academic Courses (OACs), which will supersede the current Grade XIII courses. Designed as preparatory to university studies, these new courses will form the basis for institutions' decisions on admission.

During the past two years, studies have been undertaken of the intentions of secondary school students with a view to determining just how great an OSIS-derived enrolment bulge may be expected. While many students may prefer to complete a broader background of studies before continuing to university work and therefore take five years to complete their secondary schooling, it is clear that some students, possibly a high proportion of those planning on university, will elect a 'fast-track' and complete their secondary schooling in four. With only 30 credits required for graduation, rather than the previous 33, students who do not alter their pace of study will be able to finish in four-and-a-half years.

There has been an increase in the numbers of secondary schools operating on the semester system and this may result in greater numbers of students than at present electing to enter university between the fall/winter and winter/spring terms. The universities are presently reviewing their application and admissions procedures to accommodate this trend.

In their statements on OSIS to government the universities have stressed that even a modestly augmented cohort of secondary school graduates could not be accommodated equitably unless supplementary funding were provided. And even under this premise, it would be unrealistic to think that all institutions and all programmes would have the latitude to absorb greater numbers of students than currently enrolled. Thus far, there has been no response from government, and this is a cause for worry.

The desire on the part of the universities to improve prospects for equitable treatment of applicants for admission also lay behind Council's support for achievement testing, a recommendation from the earlier Secondary Education Review Project (SERP). While acknowledging that teacher evaluation of student performance in Grade XIII courses and in the new OACs represents the best criterion for assessing students' prospects for success in university, COU takes the position that the province-wide testing in English or français and mathematics of graduating students would form a useful supplement to teacher evaluations in making admissions decisions, particularly in awarding scholarships and in offering places in limited enrolment programmes. The rationale for the tests becomes the more compelling when seen in conjunction with the expected larger number of applicants during the introductory years of OSIS. The proposal had somewhat of a red flag effect on the teachers' federation, which expressed its opposition to standardized test results also possibly being used as a means of reviewing teacher performance. At this time it appears unlikely that the COU proposal will be adopted by the Ministry of Education.

Graduates and the Labour Market

Complementing Council's studies of applicants for admission to university — both those who registered and those who did not — was the survey undertaken by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in early 1983 of relations between 1982 graduates and the labour market. The study indicated that the vast majority of graduates found employment in fields related to their main programme of study. The match was naturally closest in the case of students coming from professional and quasi-professional programmes. These findings, too, fed into the ongoing discussion of manpower planning and lent credence to the case for a free play of market forces of supply and demand, rather than the long-term planning that would be required to control intake to programmes some 4-5 years before the graduates would enter the labour force.

The period under review has also seen a re-emergence of the question of the role of universities in determining the appropriate number of graduates to be admitted to such traditional professions as medicine, law and teaching. At the present time, largely as a result of limitations on funding, enrolment in these programmes is capped. Despite this, the question has been raised both within the professions and among those responsible for public policy, who have conducted that these professions are presently over-populated with consequent adverse effects on the income of members (in the case of law) and on the cost of health care (in the case of medicine).

The universities have always held that, while they are legitimately engaged in professional education, they are not the gatekeepers of the professions and therefore should not be required to make the basic decisions on professional manpower requirements. At the same time it might be noted that, in response to substantially altered requirement for teachers, the universities have voluntarily reduced enrolment in faculties of education by almost half compared to the peak attained in the mid-70s, despite the continuing high student demand (nearly 9,000 applicants for some 3,500 places in 1985); that many graduates of law do not intend to pursue careers as self-employed professionals but to use their legal training for other career purposes; and that enrolment in faculties of medicine is strictly controlled by the Ministry of Health. Despite these facts the debate continues over how many doctors, lawyers and teachers the universities should be training.

Visa Students

As noted above, the number of foreign students studying in Ontario universities has declined sharply in the past three years. This is the result of a decision by government to increase tuition fees substantially for non-Canadians registered in universities in this province. As recently as 1981, visa students constituted nearly 10% of first-year enrolment. Now their numbers have fallen to less than 5% and appear likely to decline further. At no time has any evidence been developed to indicate that such students were displacing qualified Canadians, since most universities had quotas for visa students in programmes with limited enrolment and very high marks were required for admission. Nevertheless, there was a public perception that such was the case. The decision of government to introduce substantially higher fees for foreign students was based on the rationale that such students should pay roughly the full cost of their education. The effect was to double tuition fees for these students.

Although the universities were the beneficiaries of the additional revenue generated by these higher fees, they opposed the decision. When visa student enrolment fell by 30% in each of two years following implementation of the higher fees, the universities reasserted the value of these students, both to the universities and to the country. It was pointed out, again, that these students provide a beneficial broadening perspective for the majority Canadian student body. Moreover, many return to their home countries where they assume leadership roles of potentially very great value for Canada's future trade and cultural relations with these countries. Even within the narrower confines of the immediate economic argument, the point was made that foreign students make a not unimportant contribution to the economy of the province and the country through the fees they pay and the expenditures they make here on living and travel.

With the advent of a new government and a new Minister of Colleges and Universities who is publicly sympathetic to the plight of visa students. Council has taken up this matter again. In March 1986 Council approved a proposal that discussions be undertaken with the Minister to establish a $10 million bursary/scholarship fund with a view of offsetting differential fees for a proportion of visa students, and indicated a willingness on the part of the universities to contribute 50% of the cost of meeting this objective during an initial three-year period.

Chapter 3

Graduate Students and Faculty, Careers and Research

Graduate Enrolment

Graduate enrolments at Ontario universities in the period from 1982 to 1986 did not display the same increase as in undergraduate enrolment, although there was modest growth, fairly evenly distributed among the various disciplines. Here, too, an increase in the number of Canadian students served to offset the decline in foreign students pursuing graduate studies in Ontario which resulted from the introduction of differential fees. As with undergraduate students, these fee increases have had negative consequences on graduate student registrations, affecting not only numbers but also the mix of students. There has been a sharp decline in the number of students from some Third World countries as well as a change in the socio-economic background of those who register. However, the enrolment decline which followed the introduction of the higher fee level now appears to have been arrested, although at an unacceptably low level.

COU made representation to OCUA, and through it to the government, about the detrimental effects of these higher tuition fees for foreign graduate students. As Council noted, it was not simply a matter of foregone tuition fee revenues, or even jeopardized future cultural and trade relations. Non-Canadian students make essential contributions to graduate programmes, including their contributions to research. More fundamentally, graduate studies have a recognized international nature. Even today some 15,000 Canadian students pursue studies abroad; in the past the proportion was even higher. Canada then has a certain debt to the international university community in this regard. The role of foreign students is most clearly highlighted in the fresh perspective that such students, trained outside Canada, bring to seminars and, in particular, research work being conducted by the faculty of schools of graduate studies. Council's lobbying to forestall the introduction of the second stage increase of graduate visa student tuition fees has been successful and there is some hope that the new government will modify its other aspects of policy.

Financial obstacles also deter Canadian students from pursuing graduate studies. In addition to the attraction of the labour market for graduates in certain disciplines, there is the more general question of a student's ability to tolerate additional years of deferred or foregone earnings. More numerous and more generous graduate fellowships have been proposed as a means to prevent the 'loss' to the private sector of potential future university teachers and researchers, and to encourage the entry

of greater numbers of female graduates into advanced university work. Council has also suggested that the government review and revise the student assistance programme which is effectively restricted to undergraduates. As concerns female academic staff, one may speak of a double under-representation: both in terms of overall numbers in relation to Ontario demographics, and in specific disciplines where women's numbers have traditionally been low. Here, as in so many other areas, constrained university budgets leave supplementary external funding as the only recourse if such a solution as the fellowship incentive is to be applied to these problems. In the late Summer of 1986, the Minister announced a welcome 20% increase in the value of the Ontario Graduate Fellowship to $2,920 per term in the current academic year.

The Faculty Profile

However ironic, it must be recognized that doubtful career prospects are the single greatest deterrent to bringing appropriate numbers of new academics into the mainstream of teaching and research where they are badly needed now and where their shortage will be critical in the future. There is no one culprit here. The rapid expansion of the university system in the late 1960s and early 1970s required the appointment of large numbers of new academic staff. Not surprisingly, many of these were then fresh from graduate schools, both foreign and, increasingly, Canadian. As a consequence, the faculty age profile at Ontario universities has become skewed with a preponderance of faculty members now in their mid- to late-forties. This means that (barring major shifts in employment patterns which might occur if, for example, compulsory retirement at age 65 were precluded by human rights legislation), many of these faculty will be retiring at roughly the same time and will need to be replaced.

This foreboding prospect is reinforced by present appointment practices. Because of chronic underfunding, involving annual increases in operating grant support below or barely level with inflation, universities have lacked the funds to make many new faculty appointments. New regular tenure-track positions have for the most part been restricted to those created by faculty retirements, and there have been few of these. As a result, Ontario universities have had recourse increasingly to sessional, non-tenure track appointments, in essence, short term contracts for one or two years, many of them part-time and for teaching only, as opposed to the earlier practice of multi-year probationary appointments leading to tenure contingent upon a positive performance review as both teacher and researcher.

Holders of such short-term appointments have been called 'gypsy scholars'. While the nomadic element is clearly present — indeed, some of these academics hold concurrent part-time appointments in several institutions or combine academic duties with other employment in their efforts to stitch together an adequate income — the real academic concern is that their scholarship tends to suffer. New course responsibilities, which may differ from those of the year previous, require fresh preparatory work; travel time and costs may be multiplied; the insecure economic circumstances have their own destablizing effects. All these combine to work against productive scholarship and research, so that one may speak of arrested professional development in the case of many part-time academic staff.

Faculty Renewal

During the four-year period covered by this review there have been relatively few tenure-track appointments made at Ontario universities. Most involved 'replacements' for tenured faculty who had resigned or retired. Recognizing the acute staffing problems that Ontario universities were facing, the Bovey Commission recommended to government the establishment of a 'faculty renewal' fund to provide an additional 500 faculty positions to be awarded to young Canadian academics. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the new Liberal government has responded positively, establishing a special multi-year faculty renewal fund to support the appointment of 500 faculty in tenure-track positions. Under this plan, which is intended to increase the percentage of women faculty in Ontario universities while at the same time enhancing the opportunities for young Canadian scholars, the Ministry foresees the appointment of some 300 faculty during the first two years of the programme, 1986-87 and 1987-88. Each appointment will be supported for a five-year period and the amount of funding to be provided will be based on a specific salary level to be determined in consultation with OCUA and COU. Although the details remain to be developed, this is welcome news to the universities.

Other difficulties also continue to affect the universities' ability to determine faculty appointments. As part of its overall attack on unemployment, the federal government has instituted hiring guidelines in which preferential treatment is to be given to Canadian candidates in the evaluation of applications for academic appointments. Ontario's record in this respect has been quite defensible. Over the period fewer than one in ten of new full-time faculty appointees in Ontario universities has been other than Canadian or a landed immigrant resident in Canada. In the very great majority of the cases involving the foreign appointees, they have been in disciplines where there is a continuing shortage of qualified Canadians.

Tenure

Because of the availability of a considerable number of well-qualified candidates in many disciplines, more rigorous criteria are being applied in making appointments, particularly if they are tenured or tenure-track. Similarly, evaluation for tenure follows stringent criteria rigorously applied and probably unmatched in other professional environments. None the less, academic tenure continues to be viewed by many as unwarranted job security, rather than as a guarantee of the academic freedom that is essential to the maintenance of the university as a centre of open enquiry and debate. In 1984 Council examined a proposal for a study of academic tenure but decided against undertaking it.

Mandatory Retirement

A number of factors has combined to displace tenure as a focus for public debate. First, as noted, there have been fewer tenure-track appointments. Secondly, the universities have developed generally satisfactory terms and conditions of faculty appointment, covering tenure review, appeals against negative decisions and dis-

missal for cause of tenured faculty. As a result, these items have ceased to be major issues in faculty/university negotiations, which in recent years have been dominated by compensation issues. More recently, the issue of mandatory retirement has occupied a prominent place. When the Charter of Rights came into force in the spring of 1985 the practice of compulsorily retiring staff at age 65 was challenged in the courts. A group of faculty, including a librarian, supported by OCUFA and CAUT, launched an action in the Supreme Court of Ontario claiming that their compulsory retirement by reason of age violated their rights under the Charter. As this is written no decision has yet been rendered. Given the issues, however, irrespective of the outcome, the case seems likely to be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. Coincidentally, in late 1985 the Government of Ontario established a commission to review the Ontario Human Rights Code which permits mandatory retirement at age 65. Eventually it is likely that the mandatory termination of academic appointments at age 65 will soon cease and be replaced by a much more nuanced situation, with early retirement schemes, reduced teaching loads, continuing partial appointments, support services for retired staff (e.g., availability of secretarial, library and laboratory resources), all combining for almost 'customized' late careers for teachers and reseachers. What effect, if any, such a change will produce in the operation of tenure remains to be seen. However, it seems likely that the requirement of continuous performance review of faculty — to avoid charges of discrimination based on age — will modify current practice affecting tenured faculty.

Salaries

One of the by-products of the lengthy period of underfunding has been increasing difficulty in the annual settlement of faculty and support staff salaries. Given the traditional pattern of academic career progress, which sees young professionals beginning their careers at relatively modest salaries (considering their long years of training) and expanding their earnings over the remainder of their careers (up to 2½ times the entry level salary), a certain portion of each institution's annual salary budget is allocated for increases to continuing members of faculty (PTR - progress through the ranks). When the universities' annual increase in operating revenues is at or very near inflation, this salary commitment can be met readily only at the price of reducing the faculty complement. This potential trade-off of complement for adequate increases in salary for continuing members of faculty — increases sufficient to cover the annual increment plus inflation — has put considerable strain on faculty/administration relations and has had an adverse effect on faculty morale. At the same time, there is a lingering public perception that university faculty are overpaid and underworked. As a means of coming to grips with this myth, Council decided in March 1986 to commission a study of faculty compensation by an independent agency.

Graduate Programme Appraisal

It is widely recognized that the quality of the undergraduate educational experience has been most at risk in recent years. However, in the area of graduate studies, with

the necessarily closer tie to the research output of the university, efforts have been made over the past four years to improve quality. This has been undertaken under the aegis of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS), an affiliate of COU. OCGS has instituted periodic appraisals on a seven-year cycle of all Ontario graduate programmes, in which programme composition and balance, faculty teaching and research are all reviewed by external experts, with a view to providing constructive criticism to the university.

New graduate programmes are already appraised before being recommended to OCUA for public funding, and successful appraisal is an essential condition for their being granted funding. Programmes which fail to pass periodic appraisal will have their funding withdrawn. The means employed to enhance the quality of graduate studies are comparable in their impartiality and rigor to the procedures which accompany the granting of tenure to faculty members or the award of research grants from the federal granting agencies, where applications are subject to peer review as a basis for the agencies' allocations.

Research

Despite the restrictions imposed by underfunding, Ontario universities increased their commitment to research in the period under review. Financial constraints may have encouraged efficiency; they have surely encouraged inventiveness and a degree of entrepreneurship. The expansion in research activity has been largely in the area designated somewhat simplistically as 'applied research'. In the 80s, both industry and business, and government have grown more aware of the need for this country to invest in research. This awareness is genuine on the part of the corporate sector as it sees the need to improve this country's competitive position in the battle for world markets. On the part of governments, judging by results in terms of new policies to stimulate and support Canada's research efforts, there seems to be more rhetoric than reality in their stance. Problems related to the research responsibilities of the university are not unique to Ontario; however, since Ontario trains 45% of all graduate students in Canada and 50% of all doctoral students, as well as attracting the lion's share of research grants from the federal agencies, these problems are especially acute in this province.

Though there has been a renewed emphasis on research, and a recognition that in this country the universities play a major role in the advancement of research, for the most part this emphasis has been on applied research and development. For the universities this focus is excessively narrow. Many university researchers see increased emphasis by government on targeted funding for narrowly defined, application-oriented research as a short-term suboptimization which may result in progress in certain areas determined by government and its officials, but is not necessarily in the long-term interest of the country. This approach ignores the necessary commitment to 'pure' research. Simply put, this is research whose aim is to enhance our store of knowledge, seeking answers to questions regardless of potential practical applications. Yet the record shows that many of our most important scientific

advances have had their origins in such basic research, with significant 'returns' on the investment coming only after some time. Similarly, while most would applaud the idea of 'centres of excellence' built consciously by universities on existing strengths with a degree of self-chosen specialization, some observers have warned that this approach may jeopardize the traditional core undertaking of the university, as represented by faculties of arts and sciences. More recently, the needs of 'research intensive' universities have been identified by their administrators for special consideration.

This debate will surely continue, and is one which deserves periodic renewal in order to achieve the best balance possible within funding parameters. But independently of the nature of research sponsored by government, one may question the adequacy of the funding made available by the Government of Canada through the three federal research councils. Universities have registered their concern over the slow and at times threatened growth of these agencies' budgets. In the level of support here provided the overall pattern of Canadian investment in research and development is reflected. An increasing number of commentators has called attention to the fact that Canada's recycling of Gross National Product back into research and development is not on a par with that of other leading trading countries or countries with which Canada considers itself comparable in areas of public policy. Concerted lobbying by university researchers has brought some relief to this situation, but federal funding for research and, indeed, for post-secondary education in general remains somewhat problematic and seems to rise to the top of the threatened list as soon as discussions turn to cost-cutting and the reduction of the federal deficit. In the Spring of 1986, the federal government moved formally to cap the rate of increase in its annual transfer payments to the provinces on behalf of post-secondary education through EPF to 5%, thereby once again jeopardizing the level of support to universities.

Another important aspect of financial support for university research is the hidden cost borne on the level of the university infrastructure. Costs here are associated with equipment, energy, laboratory and other space and its maintenance, etc. Grants from the federal research agencies do not go to cover such costs and it falls to the individual university to make the necessary provisions. A major study by the Canadian Association of University Business Officers (CAUBO) for the joint federal-provincial Canadian Committee on Financing University Research puts the total base budget costs to universities for research at one dollar for every research dollar spent. Ironic as it may seem, university operating budgets are so hard pressed that senior research administrators now say that in some cases there are research grants they would be unable to accept since they cannot meet the attendant indirect costs. Here, too, the universities have sought to make their case to both levels of government, with the proposal that the provincial government take these costs into account when determining basic operating grants which have always been recognized as in support of both instruction and research.

The Private Sector

Another aspect of the question of university research, albeit predominantly in the area of applied research, is the support and encouragement provided by private industry. While the universities have traditionally been the source of highly qualified employees for the business world, new patterns of interaction have emerged in recent years. University personnel have become entrepreneurs in some cases, business leaders have become temporary or permanent lecturers in others, but in general contacts have been much more numerous and wider ranging than in the past. This trend is perhaps best exemplified by the formation in 1984 of the Corporate Higher Education Forum, where senior representatives of business and academe across Canada seek to promote this interchange of ideas and personnel, thereby reducing the time-lag between university research, in its broadest sense, and the response from the marketplace and public sphere. Other ties with the business world have also multiplied, as such concepts as 'life-long education' gain ground. Many universities now offer diploma and certificate courses as a type of professional development to various categories of business employees, on the completion of courses of study which have been worked out in collaboration between the universities and major business sectors.

Chapter 4

Inside and Outside: Collective Ventures and Public Perceptions

Many metaphors have been applied to the university. 'Ivory tower' and 'dreaming spires' are among those that have stuck longest, fairly or unfairly. Others have identified the university as a 'community of scholars' comprising both students and their teachers, and while this does not do full justice to the many important staff functions supporting these two groups, a fresh perspective can be had by pushing this image of community a bit farther and viewing the average university as in many ways similar to a small town. Thus everything that municipal government must face — commercial activity and its regulation, residential issues, public works, security, communications, employee relations, and a host of other matters — are also the daily fare of university administrators. But since the learning enterprise is rightly in the forefront, this is the unremarkable if not unseen side of the university's activities. It is also the side of the university operation where budget constraints are most felt, as efforts are made to assure that as much of the public funding as possible is devoted to the central missions of teaching, research and community service.

In order to rationalize what we might call the infrastructural dimension of university operations, a considerable degree of inter-institutional cooperation takes place among Ontario universities. Some of it in response to external regulatory pressure, e.g., from OCUA, but most of it voluntary. Much of this cooperation involves what may loosely be called vertical discipline organizations, such as the Council of Deans of Arts and Sciences or the Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine. Most of these organizations have affiliate status with COU. The most recently constituted of these organizations is the Council of Senior Administrative Officers — Universities of Ontario, formed in 1985 with a view to sharing information on matters which are common to the effective administration of most universities.

In response to specific needs, Council also has a number of standing and ad hoc committees whose mandates and activities are given in outline in the appendices of this review. Some of these are of relatively long standing, such as the graduate appraisals committees, whose work was outlined in the preceding chapter, or the operating grants committee. Others have been formed in response to emerging needs. A few examples follow.

Distance Education

A number of Ontario universities have for some time offered undergraduate credit courses to students unable to attend classes on a regular basis. The best known means

of reaching and interacting with such students has been correspondence courses, although more recently television broadcasting, despite its high costs, has also been employed. In 1983, in recognition of the facts that a potentially much larger body of prospective students, of various ages and backgrounds, might exist and that technological developments had made available a much greater range of means of delivering instruction to off-campus students, COU formed a Distance Education Committee which has worked actively since then on a number of projects. One proposal is to create a computer-conferencing network throughout Ontario, to allow a much livelier and quicker interaction between students, university instructors and course materials than in traditional correspondence courses. Another undertaking has been the compilation of a collective directory of distance education courses. Now in its second printing, it describes more than 300 credit courses which are presently available through one or more of the distance education modes. The Committee is also working toward facilitating the transfer of academic credits gained at one university toward a degree awarded by another university — a natural consequence of the possibility of taking distance education courses from a number of institutions.

Interuniversity Athletics

More recently, in June 1985 Council established an Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics on the completion of a study conducted by a special committee. The Commission will not replace the existing athletics leagues, but will act to ensure that academic considerations are always placed first. It will also monitor areas such as the eligibility of students to participate in athletics and the scheduling of league activity. To assist in its activities the Commission has appointed an Executive Secretary with quarters in the COU secretariat.

Status of Women

Because of increasing activities in the area, including government initiatives involving employment equity, in the spring of 1985 COU struck a Committee on the Status of Women. Its task was to generate, collate and analyze information on the status of women in Ontario universities (including faculty, support staff and students); to serve as a focal point for discussion of the issues among the universities; and to advise Council on policy and strategies for improving the status of women in Ontario universities. Since its establishment this Committee has been active in a number of areas. It prepared a brief for COU which was presented to a legislative committee holding public hearings to receive comment on a Green Paper on equal pay for work of equal value. It has also been involved in advising the government on the best ways of allocating to the university sector monies from the Employment Equity Incentive Fund. At the present time, with assistance from a consultant it is engaged in the preparation of an employment equity manual for universities.

Health Sciences

In recent years the pace of activity in the area of health sciences has increased. The small health sciences secretariat which serves the various groups engaged in cooper-

ative activities in this area now acts on behalf of the Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine, the Ontario Council of University Health Sciences, which handles nursing, dentistry, pharmacy, occupational and physical therapy, optometry and other non-medical disciplines in the health sciences, and the Health Sciences Liaison Committee, comprised of the executive heads of those universities with health sciences centres. In the past year these groups, acting conjointly, have established a body to coordinate research activities in health sciences in Ontario universities, the Ontario Universities Council on Health Research.

French Language Centre

Not all of Council's committees have been as successful. As a consequence of the large number of elementary and secondary pupils now in French immersion programmes and other pupils taking core French, in 1982 the French Studies Committee proposed the establishment of a centre which would assist members of university French departments in providing effective second language instruction, and would similarly assist faculty in other departments in offering a selection of their present courses through the medium of the French language. Regrettably, the project is now in limbo as a result of problems associated with funding. The universities were reluctant to see funds skimmed off from other activities to finance the new undertaking and the provincial government has thus far been unresponsive to requests for the relatively modest sums required to establish the centre. Much the same fate has befallen the work of COU's Committee on the Disabled, where it has not even been possible to obtain the funding required for a comprehensive survey of needs among disabled students, present and future, and the requirements of Ontario universities to meet these needs.

Other Collective Activities

Some collective activities undertaken by Council have functioned so well as almost to pass unnoticed. Among these are the Interuniversity Transit System (IUTS), which assures the sure, rapid and cost-efficient transfer of books and documents among the universities, and the Ontario Universities' Application Centre in Guelph, which annually processes some 190,000 applications for admission to university from some 70,000 applicants, mostly from applicants to first year. These come mainly from Ontario secondary students (48,000) but include as well secondary school matriculants from other provinces and from offshore (22,000). The Centre also serves the five faculties of medicine and the eleven faculties/schools of education.

National Universities Week

The secondary school liaison programme described in Chapter 2 may be seen as one dimension of the universities' ongoing public relations programme, and it is naturally complemented by a host of others, undertaken by individual universities and by Council's communications division. Chief among these, perhaps, was a first National Universities Week, held in 1983, on the theme "We Have the Future in

Minds" and repeated two years later on the theme "Extending Ideas Into Your Community". Another example of collective activity is the annual forum sponsored by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, where topics have included new technologies in the electronics age and biotechnology. Through the auspices of COU, Ontario university administrators have also established a fruitful exchange with their counterparts from the Swedish university system, with a number of workshops and seminars conducted in both Ontario and Sweden.

The Public Image

After this review of some of the many behind-the-scenes and other more public collaborative activities of Ontario universities, it is legitimate to ask just what their collective public image might be. One means of determining public perceptions is to conduct a survey, and for some years COU has participated in a survey of public attitudes towards education issues, conducted by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Support for the university undertaking, as measured in the 1984 survey published in early 1985, is high and it is striking that more than 80% of respondents felt that increases in university funding should keep pace with, or outstrip, general inflation. The harder question is naturally: where should such funds come from? The universities have never made a case that the needed increases should come from any other publicly funded sector. Nor have they asked the public to rank priorities. But just as respondents to the questionnaire were not asked how improved university funding should be achieved, they showed little inclination to redefine the role of the university in Ontario society. One has the impression of a generally held but rather diffuse conception of the university as an institution with a special mandate, one that is largely being well discharged with relatively little government or public input.

This impression is sustained by a review of editorial writing on university matters in Ontario newspapers. Some few major newspapers in Ontario have been almost unquestioningly supportive of the universities, and their statements have largely been a call for improved government funding in general operating funds or, more specifically, in support of research. But with the possible exception of the occasional highlighting of an important scientific development stimulated by university research work, there has been little detailed scrutiny of the larger role of the university. Other major papers have perhaps moved to neutral ground from the somewhat more antagonistic stance they previously took. They have, for example, recognized the inevitable interrelationship of accessibility, quality and finance and, on the publication of government-sponsored or other reports, have signalled the need for prompt action by government. But here again, there has been no question of, or contribution toward, a redefinition of the university in Ontario in the mid-1980s. Yet these editorialists surely have a concept of the university, if unarticulated, and have been quick to pounce on, for example, any abuse of the practices of tenure and sabbatical leave, freedom of speech, hiring practices, research ethics adn the like. Finally, some few newspapers present a largely undocumented view of university administrators as financial wastrels and whiners.

This was the situation in early 1986 when the universities judged that whatever 'window of opportunity' as might exist with the new Liberal government was rapidly glazing over, and that a new dimension must be added to communications activities before Queen's Park settled back into known ways. COU then undertook a two-week fact-finding and public awareness campaign with the objective of determining and publicizing the degree to which chronic underfunding had affected the quality of instruction at Ontario universities. The centre-piece of the campaign was a tour of most Ontario university communities and campuses by members of Council. This brought representatives of other universities into situations where their fresh perspective on the threat to quality, on both the institutional and system levels, attracted the attention of community leaders, the media, campus constituencies such as faculty and student associations, and local and provincial politicians. Events included tours of overcrowded facilities, presentations by campus groups, interviews with media, distribution of campaign buttons and special publications. In many instances student and faculty leaders joined COU members in meeting other opinion leaders, soliciting their views and sharing with them the findings of the tour.

The campaign generated extensive media coverage and led to a report in a public forum to the Minister of Colleges and Universities on the jeopardized quality of the Ontario university experience. Among the most rewarding aspects of the tour in the minds of participants were meetings with the editorial boards of Ontario newspapers. While some in the past seemed to have made up their minds about the local university, all gave an open welcome to representatives from other institutions bringing system level considerations to their attention. The dozen or so editorials which resulted from these meetings are unequivocal statements of concern for the grave situation into which universities have been forced by financial constraints.

These editorials recognized the strength and value of the Ontario university system, and the jeopardy in which it now finds itself. But without public and political will the effect of even the most supportive editorials must be ephemeral. Does Ontario not want a debate on the future of its universities? The universities' hesitancy to celebrate publicly their individual and collective accomplishments, the silence into which both objective reports and subjective harangues fell, the failure of both the federal and the Ontario governments to initiate discussion of, let alone draft, new policies with regard to universities, all suggest that it does not.

Chapter 5

Conclusion: Light on the Horizon

As the universities of Ontario prepared for the beginning of the 1986-87 academic year there were signs that the long period of financial constraint was coming to an end. The inertia that had characterized university/government relations during the first half of the 80s seemed to have been overcome. Several promising undertakings were set in motion, though many apparently intractable problems remained.

Enrolment continued at a high level; the university research enterprise developed ongoing vitality; public and corporate confidence in the universities was increasingly evident; new modes of financing were being explored and government seemed both more willing and more able to effect progress towards supporting the kind of university system which Ontario needed and deserved.

The coming months will determine whether the government's stated commitment to the universities is genuine and enduring. The test will be whether it provides the universities with the resources necessary for them to fulfill their mission and the government's objectives for them. If the means are provided, it will then be up to the universities to set about repairing the ravages of a long period of restraint while moving effectively to meet new challenges and opportunities. The next quadrennium will determine whether the events of 1985-86 represent a false dawn or the beginnings of a new day.

Appendix A

Members of the Council of Ontario Universities and Secretariat at November 1, 1986

	Members
Brock University	— A.J. Earp, President*, *Chairman* J.G. Benjafield, Department of Psychology
Carleton University	— W.E. Beckel, President D. Fraser, Department of Law
University of Guelph	— B.C. Matthews, President G.F. Todd, Department of Fine Art
Lakehead University	— R.G. Rosehart, President I.M. Hoodless, Department of Chemistry
Laurentian University	— J. Daniel, President D. Coulombe, Directeur, Collège de Hearst
McMaster University	— A.A. Lee, President* R.F. Childs, Dean, Faculty of Science
Université d'Ottawa	— A. D'Iorio, Rector M. McGee, Director, School of Nursing
Queen's University	— D.C. Smith, Principal J. Knox, Department of Psychology
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute	— B. Segal, President J. Easton, Department of Applied Chemical and Biological Sciences
University of Toronto	— G.E. Connell, President* M.E. Irwin, Associate Dean (Academic) Scarborough Campus
Trent University	— D. Theall, President D. Glassco, Department of English
University of Waterloo	— D.T. Wright, President B.D. McPherson, Faculty of Human Kinetics and Leisure Studies
University of Western Ontario	— G. Pedersen, President* R.G. Kidd, Department of Chemistry
Wilfrid Laurier University	— J.A. Weir, President R. Elliott, Faculty of Arts and Science*
University of Windsor	— R. Ianni, President G. Booth, Director of Part-Time Studies*
York University	— H. Arthurs, President*, *Vice-Chairman* — G.E. Denzel, Department of Mathematics

*Member of the Executive Committee

Associate Members

Ontario College of Art	— N.B. Hathaway, President M. Egan Haines, Industrial Design
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	— J. House, Acting Director C. Watson, Higher Education Group
Royal Military College of Canada	— W. Niemy, Commandant J.B. Plant, Principal

Secretariat

E.J. Monahan, Executive Director*
G.G. Clarke, Secretary and Deputy to the Executive Director
E.E. Cummings, Assistant Secretary and Executive Assistant

Research Division
- E.K. DesRosiers, Director of Research
- J.A. McAllister, Research Associate
- L.C. Payton, Research Associate
- L.J. Selleck, Research Associate

Office of Communications
- W. Sayers, Director

Office of Health Sciences
- K. Kirker, Co-ordinator

Ontario Council on Graduate Studies
- M.H. Yeates, Executive Vice-Chairman
- C. Filteau, Administrative Assistant

Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics
- M. Pattison, Executive Secretary

OSIS Liaison Officer
- R.W. Van Fossen

Ontario Universities' Application Centre
- H.H. Pettipiere, Director
- G.S. Arthurs, Assistant Director

*Member of the Executive Committee

Appendix B

Constitution

Council of Ontario Universities
Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario

(This body was formed on December 3, 1962, with the original name of the "Committee of Presidents of Provincially Assisted Universities and Colleges of Ontario." A formal constitution was first adopted on December 9, 1966, under the name "Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario/Comité des Présidents d'Université de l'Ontario." The constitution was amended on January 18, 1968; April 26, 1968; March 13, 1970; and April 16, 1971. On the latter date, the name of the body was changed to its present one, effective May 1, 1971.)

1. Name
   (1) The name of this body shall be: "Council of Ontario Universities/Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario."

2. Objects
   (1) The objects of the Council are to promote cooperation among the provincially assisted universities of Ontario, and between them and the Government of the Province, and, generally, to work for the improvement of higher education for the people of Ontario.

3. Membership
   (1) Those eligible for membership are (a) the executive heads of provincially assisted universities in Ontario which grant university degrees (a power conferred by a legislative or parliamentary act or charter in which such authority is specifically stated) but excluding institutions whose power to grant degrees is limited to a single professional field; and (b) one colleague, elected to membership by the senior academic body of each such institution.
   (2) Colleagues elected to membership by the senior academic body of those institutions defined in article 3, section (1), part (a), shall hold office for a term of one year, renewable.
   (3) At the time of the coming into force of this amendment on May 1, 1971, members shall be the executive heads and elected colleagues of the universities as defined in article 3, section (1), part (a) . . . .
   (4) Members from other institutions which become eligible to provide members may be admitted if recommended by the Executive Committee and approved by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting at a meeting of the Council.

4. Officers
   (1) The Council shall have a Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall serve without remuneration.
   (2) The Council shall have a Vice-Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall act for the Chairman in the absence of the latter. He, too, shall service without remuneration.
   (3) The Council shall have as its senior paid officer an Executive Director, appointed by the Executive Committee with the concurrence of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Council. Included in his functions shall be those of secretary and treasurer of the Council.
   (4) The Council may have other paid officers, and sub-staff, as deemed necessary by the Executive.

5. Committees
   (1) There shall be a committee called "the Executive" composed of eight members: the Chairman of the Council (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Director (who shall have no vote), the immediate past Chairman (ex officio), and four others. The membership of eight shall include at least one from the University of Toronto, one from among the emergent universities and four from the intermediate-sized universities. Its function is to guide the Council and, on occasion, to act for it between meetings of the Council.
   (2) There shall be a "Committee on Nominations," named by the Chairman with the approval of the Executive. It shall propose candidates for the elective offices and for membership of the Executive. It may also, from time to time, nominate members of other committees, and shall review committee membership and terms of reference as provided for by subsection (5) below.
   (3) There may be such other committees (standing and special) as are deemed necessary.
   (4) Members of standing committees shall serve for terms of not more than two years. They may be reappointed. Members of a special committee normally will serve for the duration of the committee.
   (5) At least once every two years, normally after the election of officers and the naming of a new Executive, the Committee on Nominations shall review the terms of reference and membership of committees of the Council and suggest to the Executive such changes as may seem desirable.

6. Affiliates
   (1) Other organizations or associations of personnel serving in the universities of Ontario may be affiliated to the Council.
   (2) Such bodies may be established by the Council or may come into being on the initiative of others.
   (3) Normally an affiliate would have some executive power delegated to it, explicitly or implicitly, by the Council.
   (4) Affiliates shall be responsible to the Council with respect to those of their interests and functions which fall within the scope of the activities of the Council.

7. Meetings
   (1) The Council shall meet at least twice a year.
   (2) Meetings of the Council and of the Executive may be called by the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Director, or any three other members of the Council.
   (3) A member who is the executive head of an institution and is unable to attend a meeting of the Council may be represented at the meeting by an alternate of his choosing. A member who is an elected colleague who is unable to attend a meeting of the Council may be represented by an alternate selected by the senior academic body of the institution he represents. Alternates shall have the power to vote at the meeting.
   (4) Committees will meet as required.
   (5) A majority of the members of the Council or of a committee shall constitute a quorum for a meeting of the Council or committee concerned.

8. Finance
   (1) The fiscal year of the Council shall end June 30.
   (2) The chief source of financial support of the Council shall be subscriptions paid by the universities whose executive heads are members of the Council.
   (3) The scale of membership subscriptions shall be set by action of the Council.
   (4) The Council may receive additional financial support from other sources.

(5) The accounts of the Council may be audited by a firm of auditors appointed by authority of the Council for terms of one year, renewable.

9. Amendment

(1) This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds majority of members of the Council present and voting at a meeting in the notice of which the proposed amendment is specified and at which at least two-thirds of the members are present.

10. Dissolution

(1) The Council may be dissolved by a two-thirds majority of members of the Council present and voting at a meeting in the notice of which the motion for dissolution is specified and at which at least two-thirds of the members are present.

(2) In the event of dissolution of the Council, all assets and property of the Council shall, after payment of its just debts and obligations, be distributed to one or more charitable organizations in Canada, as may be determined by the Council.

Appendix C

Committees, Affiliates and Other Related Groups of the Council of Ontario Universities at November 1, 1986

Committees

Standing Committees

1. *Executive Committee*
   Task:
   (a) To guide the Council and, on occasion, to act for it between meetings of the Council;
   (b) to appoint the Executive Director, with the concurrence of at least two-thirds of the members of the Council;
   (c) to determine the necessity of other paid officers and sub-staff;
   (d) to approve the membership of the Committee on Nominations (which is named by the chairman);
   (e) to make any necessary changes in the terms of reference and membership of other committees;
   (f) to set up special committees as required.

   Membership:
   Eight members: The Chairman of the Council (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Director (who shall have no vote), the immediate past Chairman (ex officio), and four others. The membership of eight shall include at least one from the University of Toronto, one from among the emergent universities, and four from the intermediate-sized universities.

2. *Committee on Nominations*
   Task:
   To propose candidates for elective offices and for membership of committees.

   Membership
   Three members: The Executive Director and two members named by the Chairman of the Council.

3. *Committee on Operating Grants*
   Task:
   (a) To study matters pertaining to the provincial government operating grants system and to make recommendations on these matters to the Council;
   (b) to maintain liaison with the relevant sub-committee of the Ontario Council on University Affairs;
   (c) to undertake such other related tasks as may be assigned by the Council.

   Membership:
   Eight members: At least one from a large university, one from a university of intermediate size, and one from a small university.

4 *Committee on Enrolment Statistics and Projections*

Task:

(a) To undertake studies of the pattern of enrolment within and among Ontario institutions;
(b) to make projections of enrolment for the Ontario university system;
(c) to aggregate and analyze individual university projections in the light of a review of limits on capacity; and
(d) to serve as a resource on enrolment statistics and projects for individual universities, the Council and concerned government agencies.

Membership:

Six members. Persons with expertise in dealing with enrolment statistics and projections.

5 *Committee on Diagnostic Achievement Testing*

Task:

(a) To make recommendations to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities on funding for development of tests, based on a review of the quality of proposals and the establishment of priorities when necessary;
(b) to encourage cooperation among the universities in the development and use of diagnostic tests;
(c) to monitor testing development on an on-going basis and report to COU and MCU thereon; and
(d) to recommend to COU and MCU on any desirable modifications in the conditions for approval of projects in the light of experience.

Membership:

Five members. To include persons knowledgeable in testing, specialists in learning skill development, individuals responsible for academic programme policy, persons with an overview of the demands of university study, and at least one representative from the secondary schools.

6 *Committee on Distance Education*

Task:

(a) To provide a forum for the consideration of issues and problems facing the university system in developing and co-ordinating distance education programmes;
(b) to facilitate such joint efforts as may be deemed appropriate in Ontario to enhancing the quality and accessibility of distance learning opportunities;
(c) to rationalize distance education, and to strive for cost-effectiveness in programmed delivery;
(d) to maintain continuing liaison on behalf of the universities of Ontario with all external agencies which might abet distance learning opportunities in Ontario, as well as with organizations representing present and prospective learners; and
(e) to prepare and submit an annual report to the Council.

Membership:

One representative appointed by each COU member institution with an interest in distance education.

7. *SERP/ROSE/OSIS Liaison Committee*

Task:

(a) To facilitate communication between the universities and the Ministry of Education on the renewal of secondary education arising out of the SERP/ROSE reports and the OSIS document;

(b) to provide a consultative forum for the COU Liaison Officer for SERP/ROSE; and

(c) to report to COU through the Liaison Officer.

Membership:

One representative from each member institution.

8. *Committee on the Status of Women in Ontario Universities*

Task:

(a) To generate, collate and analyze information on the status of women (including faculty, support staff and students) in Ontario universities of a nature useful for policy purposes;

(b) to serve as a focal point for discussion among the universities on the status of women in the institutions; and

(c) to advise Council on policies and strategies for ensuring equity for women in Ontario universities which might serve as a basis either for concerted action or as models for consideration by member institutions, including the recruitment and advancement of qualified women for faculty, administrative and other support staff positions; equity in employment conditions for women; accessibility and study conditions for women students; and other aspects of the status of women on campus that the Committee deems appropriate for collective review.

Membership:

An expert committee of 7 to 9 persons, including one or more executive heads, persons with particular expertise and profile in matters of employment equity, and women (both academic and non-academic) in positions of administrative authority in the universities.

9. *Communications Advisory Committee*

Task:

(a) To advise Council through its Executive Committee on middle- and long-term strategies for government and public relations as concerns both messages and vehicles, with a view to achieving objectives as set by Council; and

(b) to assure effective liaison between Council and other temporary or more permanent bodies (external public affairs consultants, the Committee of Information Directors, task forces) in both developing and implementing communications strategies.

Membership:

The Chairman of Council (ex officio) and three further members of Council, of whom at least two shall be executive heads, three senior administrators in institutional relations or senior academics from member institutions, the Executive Director of Council or his Deputy, and the Director of Communications. Members of the Committee will serve an initial term of two years.

10. *Board of Management - Application Centre*
Task:
(a) To recommend to COU policy concerning the scope of services to be offered by the Ontario Universities' Application Centre;
(b) to recommend to COU the annual budget of revenue and expenditure for the Application Centre;
(c) to review and evaluate the operation of the Application Centre and report thereon to COU annually;
(d) to approve proposals from the Director on major changes in the internal operation of the Application Centre, and to advise the Director on any other matters which he wishes to bring forward;
(e) to consult regularly with the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions concerning the services required by this Council for undergraduate applications;
(f) to consult regularly with the Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine concerning the services required by this Council for medical applications;
(g) to consult regularly with the Association of Deans of Education in Ontario Universities concerning the services required by this Association for teacher education applications;
(h) to consult as required with representatives of the secondary schools, appropriate government departments, and other agencies which have an interest in the work of the centre.

Membership:
Nine members: The membership shall reflect a reasonable balance of the interests of various user groups, and nominations shall be solicited appropriately by COU. The Executive Director of COU shall be a member (ex officio).

Standing Joint Committees (active)

Tripartite Committee on Interprovincial Comparisons
Task:
To obtain reliable information on the levels of support provided for university education in the various provinces.

Membership:
Three members: One member from COU, one from OCUA and one from MCU.

Standing Committees (concluded during the past four years)

1. *Advisory Committee on Academic Planning (a Committee of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies)*
Task:
(a) To assist the discipline groups in promoting the rationalization of graduate studies within the universities;
(b) to advise OCGS on steps to be taken to implement effective provincial planning of graduate development;
(c) to recommend, through OCGS, to COU the carrying out of planning assessments of disciplines or discipline groups and to recommend suitable arrangements and procedures for each assessment;

(d) to supervise the conduct of each planning assessment approved by COU;
(e) to respond to requests by COU to have a discipline assessment conducted by proposing suitable arrangements;
(f) to submit to COU the reports of the assessments together with any recommendations which the Committee wishes to make.

Membership:
At least seven members: Members of the professoriate in the Ontario universities. The members shall serve for such periods of time as OCGS may determine, and they shall be selected in such manner as may provide a reasonable balance of academic disciplines and of universities. The members of the Committee shall be appointed as individuals.

2. *Committee on Faculty and Staff Information (previously Committee on Academic Staff Information.)*
Task:
(a) To continue to examine information needs on faculty and to monitor the data elements contained in the Statistics Canada UCASS file;
(b) to deal with requests for access to the UCASS data for legitimate research purposes when such requests fall outside Statistics Canada's normal accessibility rules;
(c) to determine information needs on staff, to develop methodologies for the collection of staff data, and to monitor the collection of these data; and
(d) to serve as an official consultative agency to COU, MCU, OCUA and individual universities on request in matters relating to faculty and staff data.

Membership:
Eight members.

Special Committees (established and concluded during the past four years)

1. *Special Committee on BILD Administrative Procedures*
Task:
(a) To review the administrative procedures employed in the first year of the BILD Research Equipment Grant Programme;
(b) to review the administrative procedures employed in the first year of the BILD Matching (Contract) Research Grant Programme;
(c) to make recommendations on ways in which the administration of these programmes could improve the effectiveness of these programmes and facilitate a smooth working relationship among government, the universities, and researchers;
(d) to report to COU by 31 October 1982.

Membership:
Six members.

2. *Special Committee on Secondary School Liaison*
Task:
(a) To review the objectives of cooperative secondary school liaison by the Ontario universities in the light of current circumstances;
(b) to review the organization and management of the cooperative secondary school liaison programmes;
(c) to review the budget and source of income for the cooperative liaison activities;
(d) to report to COU with recommendations in the above areas by 31 October 1982.

Membership:
Nine members, including representation from Council, university registrarial, admissions and information functions, the Ontario Universities' Application Centre, the Ontario Secondary School Headmasters' Council and the Ontario Secondary School Counsellors' Association.

3. *Special Committee on the Feasibility of an Ontario Universities Records Centre*
Task:
(a) To consider the desirability of establishing an Ontario Universities Records Centre for low cost centralized storage of university records;
(b) to provide a feasibility assessment, including estimation of capital and operating costs of such a centre;
(c) to consider the relationship of this idea to the notion of centralized depository library facilities;
(d) to report to COU by 31 October 1982.

Membership:
Five members, including a chief librarian, archivist, finance officer and physical plant officer.

4. *Special Committee on the Corporate Sponsorship of Intercollegiate Athletics*
Task:
(a) To propose guidelines for negotiating the corporate sponsorship of intercollegiate athletics; and
(b) to report back to Council.

Membership:
Representatives of COU and the Ontario Universities Athletic Association.

5. *Special Committee on Teacher Education*
Task:
(a) To review the adequacy of current requirements for the professional training of teachers for certification in Ontario, and recommend on a suitable content, organization, and duration for the pre-service programme leading to the degree Bachelor of Education;
(b) more specifically to examine the feasibility of meeting the above-mentioned professional requirements by means of a compulsory two-year BEd pre-service programme and to compare this proposal to alternative ways of meeting the requirements;
(c) to report to COU at the earliest practical date, preferably not later than 31 January 1984.

Membership:
Six members.

6. *Special Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics*
Task:
(a) To examine the organizational structure and programming of intercollegiate athletics in Ontario universities. (This will include intercollegiate athletic activities sponsored through the Ontario Universities Athletic Association [OUAA] and the Ontario Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Association [OWIAA], and the new Intercollegiate league proposed by Queen's, Toronto and Western).

- To include in the examination the following areas:
  1. Institutional philosophies of intercollegiate athletics for both men and women, including the relationship between academic and athletic objectives, institutional structures for the administration and management of intercollegiate athletics, including admission requirements for student athletes;
  2. Programming of intercollegiate athletics, including breadth of programming (range of sports for men and women), quality of programming (competition) and scheduling;
  3. Financial support for intercollegiate athletics, including corporate sponsorship, and provisions for recruiting and support of student athletes (athletic scholarships and other prerequisites);
  4. Structure of intercollegiate athletics, including institutional relations with OUAA, OWIAA, COU, CIAU and Sports Canada;

(b) To report with recommendation to COU not later than 30 April 1985.

Membership:
Six members to be named by the Executive Committee of COU: two members of COU, one member each from OUAA and OWIAA, to be named after consultation with these two groups, one administrator of athletic affairs and an external chairman. COU Executive Director to serve as Secretary.

7. *Special Committee on Macro-Indicators*
Task:
To receive and review the output of the Tripartite Committee on Macro-Indicators and to advise COU generally on Macro-Indicators.

Membership:
Seven members.

8. *Special Committee on Disabled Persons*
Task:
(a) Assessment of current services and physical facilities in the universities of Ontario to meet the special needs of the handicapped;
(b) identification of the need for alteration in the physical plants of the universities and for special facilities, having due regard for the costs and effectiveness of these measures, together with an assessment of priorities;
(c) estimation of costs, both capital and operating, of economically providing effective education and support services for the handicapped within the Ontario university system;
(d) examination of the feasibility of providing specialized facilities in some universities for the education of particular groups of handicapped students;
(e) review of the need for adaption of the Ontario Student Assistance Program and other funding programmes to meet the needs of handicapped individuals;
(f) formulation of a provincial plan for the handicapped in Ontario universities in the light of the foregoing considerations.

Membership:
A member of Council (Chairman), a nominee from the Committee on Student Affairs, a nominee from the Association of Physical Plant and Planning Administrators, one or two individuals experienced in dealing with the educational, emotional and physical needs of handicapped university students, a rehabilitation therapist, a handicapped student, and a nominee of a provincial organization for the handicapped.

Special Joint Committees (established and concluded during the past four years)

1. *Joint Steering Committee to Review Library Cooperation*
   Task:
   To review the future of library cooperation among Ontario universities.

   Membership:
   Two representatives from each of the Board for Library Coordination and the Ontario Council of University Libraries and one from COU.

2. *COU/OCUFA Joint Working Party on Pension Portability*
   Task:
   (a) To review the current state of portability of retirement plans for faculty in Ontario universities;
   (b) to examine the implications of establishing universal portability within Ontario of retirement plans for faculty. (It is understood that this examination will be undertaken in consultation with the Canadian Life Insurance Association);
   (c) to recommend to Ontario universities through COU and OCUFA ways and means of extending portability of retirement plans for faculty within Ontario, and a timetable for so doing.

   Membership:
   Four members: Two representatives each from OCUFA and COU.

Affiliates

1. Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions
2. Ontario Council on Graduate Studies
3. Ontario Council of University Libraries
4. Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine
5. Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering
6. Ontario Council for University Continuing Education
7. Ontario University Registrars' Association
8. Ontario Council of Library Schools
9. Committee of Deans of Ontario Faculties of Law
10. Council of Deans of Arts and Science of the Ontario Universities
11. Ontario Council of University Health Sciences
12. Ontario Committee on Student Affairs
13. Association of Deans of Education in Ontario Universities
14. Association of Computer Services Directors
15. Committee of Deans and Directors of Ontario Schools of Social Work
16. Committee of Ontario University Music Administrators
17. Committee of Information Directors
18. Liaison Committee for Health Services
19. Council of Senior Administrative Officers - Universities of Ontario
    Affiliates: Committee of Finance Officers - Universities of Ontario
    Ontario Association of University Personnel Administrators
    Ontario Association of University Physical Plant and Planning Administrators
    Ontario University Purchasing Management Association
    Operations Planning and Analysis Group

Other Related Groups

1. *Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics*
   Task:
   (a) To oversee interuniversity athletics in Ontario universities including the operations of the two Ontario interuniversity athletics leagues, and to establish broad matters of policy including league external and corporate relations;
   (b) to serve as an advisory body to the two Ontario interuniversity athletic leagues, the member institutions and COU on all matters of policy and procedure affecting interuniversity athletics in Ontario;
   (c) to serve as a court of appeal on any matter brought to it by any group of members of either interuniversity league according to the agreed upon appeals procedure, or by either league;
   (d) to name the Executive Secretary, Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics;
   (e) to name the Auditor, Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics;
   (f) to issue an annual report to the league, the member institutions and COU.

   Membership:
   A commission composed of seven members - three executive heads or senior academic administrators of Ontario universities, one of whom would be the Chairman, two academics named by the Council of Ontario Universities, and the presidents of the two interuniversity athletics leagues (OUAA and OWIAA). In addition, the Executive Secretary, OCIA, would sit with the Commission *ex officio* as a non-voting member.

2. *Vice-Presidents (Academic) Group*
   An informal group comprising the Vice-Presidents (Academic) of COU member institutions meets from time to time to review undergraduate academic programming and other matters affecting the responsibilities of these academic administrative officers.

Appendix D

Financial Statements

The following are condensed summaries of information contained in annual financial statements of C.O.U. Holding Association Inc., the company incorporated to manage the business affairs of the Council of Ontario Universities, and its predecessor C.O.U. Holdings Limited.

C.O.U. Holding Association Inc.
General Operations
Summary of Income and Expenditures
for the Fiscal Years 1981-82 to 1985-86

	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
EXPENDITURES					
Administration and Research	$683,020	$802,124	$787,203	$824,797	$862,880
Office of Communications	94,740	136,122	138,787	145,485	244,069
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies	112,229	88,820	93,734	85,644	85,932
Interuniversity Transit System	202,998	209,617	214,948	215,234	236,661
Renewal of Secondary Education			32,738	28,319	49,154
Distance Education			8,915	17,085	51,253
Special Projects	17,120	10,979	9,709	22,083	14,896
Office of Teaching and Learning	87,033				
Interuniversity Athletics				4,120	26,031
Total	1,197,140	1,247,662	1,286,034	1,342,767	1,570,876
INCOME					
Membership	1,091,510	1,200,439	1,290,000	1,374,000	1,443,000
Other	109,440	100,270	77,490	85,699	93,131
Total	1,200,950	1,300,709	1,367,490	1,459,699	1,536,131
UNAPPROPRIATED SURPLUS					
Year	3,810	53,047	81,456	116,932	(34,745)
Beginning	184,865	180,675	208,722	262,178	366,583
Expenditures from prior years' appropriations			6,000	17,473	2,414
Appropriations	(8,000)	(25,000)	(34,000)	(30,000)	(37,295)
End	180,675	208,722	262,178	366,583	296,957
APPROPRIATED SURPLUS					
Beginning		8,000	33,000	61,000	73,527
Appropriations	8,000	25,000	34,000	30,000	37,295
Expenditures			(6,000)	(17,473)	(2,414)
End	$8,000	$33,000	$61,000	$73,527	$108,408

Note: All expenditures are shown net of income from self-supporting projects or special income from outside sources.

C.O.U. Holding Association Inc.: Self-Supporting Activities
Summary of Income and Expenditures for the Fiscal Years 1981-82 to 1985-86

	1981-82			1982-83			1983-84		
	Surplus (deficit) beginning of year	Income	Expenditures	Surplus (deficit) end of year	Income	Expenditures	Surplus (deficit) end of year	Income	Expenditures
Ontario Universities' Application Centre	$ 160,269	$1,032,388	$ 964,727	$ 227,930	$1,101,496	$1,034,937	$ 294,489	$1,092,519	$1,165,092
Graduate Studies Appraisals Committee	(1,415)	83,290	99,588	(17,713)	359,480	322,850	18,917	266,545	263,033
Canadian Association of Graduate Schools	1,383	6,702	8,085		6,584	6,348	236	5,443	5,211
Office of Health Sciences Secretariat	7,566	55,400	62,600	366	69,050	74,530	(5,114)	70,300	52,430
Special projects	2,021	40,381	39,569	2,833	2,906	5,739		10,500	14,076
Achievement Testing	(3,975)	33,986	32,054	(2,043)	15,168	18,930	(5,805)	43,776	36,020
Educational Development Sweden/Canada workshops	9,141	99,820	89,558	19,403		6,705	12,698	39,059	25,737
Special projects	7,207	13,619	9,747	11,079		1,594	9,485	1,500	(228)
Library Union Catalogue Project	10,000	36,266	45,266	1,000	(3,130)	704	(2,834)	2,834	
Other		417	417		21,648	21,648			446
	$ 192,197	$1,402,269	$1,351,611	$ 242,855	$1,573,202	$1,493,985	$ 322,072	$1,532,476	$1,561,817

C.O.U. Holding Association Inc.: Self-Supporting Activities
Summary of Income and Expenditures for the Fiscal Year 1981-82 to 1985-86 (cont'd)

	1984-85			1985-86			
	Surplus (deficit) beginning of year	Income	Expenditures	Surplus (deficit) end of year	Income	Expenditures	Surplus (deficit) end of year
Ontario Universities' Application Centre	$ 221,916	$1,061,352	$1,079,541	$ 203,727	$1,249,178	$1,088,044	$ 364,861
Graduate Studies Appraisals Committee	22,429	201,725	204,422	19,732	264,695	249,644	34,783
Canadian Association of Graduate Schools	468	6,308	6,100	676		3	673
Office of Health Sciences Secretariat	12,756	70,300	62,528	20,528	70,300	74,933	15,895
Special projects	(3,576)	5,200	1,624				
Achievement Testing	1,951	38,958	35,130	5,779	62,569	66,930	1,418
Educational Development Sweden/Canada workshops	26,020	6,986	6,168	26,838		88	26,750
Special projects	11,213		6,552	4,661		(23)	4,684
Seminar on Teaching Excellence		13,156	13,156				
Employment Equity Manual					40,000		40,000
Other	(446)	946	545	(45)	4,394	4,332	17
	$ 292,731	$1,404,931	$1,415,766	$ 281,896	$1,691,136	$1,483,951	$ 489,081

Appendix E

Publications of the Council of Ontario Universities and its Affiliates

Listed here are all publications released since the last *Review*, except for annual series and those which have been superseded, and a selection of publications from earlier years deemed to be still of general interest.

Number	*Title*	*Price*
	Previous Reviews	
67-1	System Emerging: First Annual Review (1967) 59 pp.	Gratis
68-1	Collective Autonomy: Second Annual Review (1968) 65 pp.	Gratis
69-1	Campus and Forum: Third Annual Review (1969) 78 pp.	Gratis
70-5	Variations on a Theme: Fourth Annual Review (1970) 77 pp.	Gratis
71-15	Participatory Planning: Fifth Annual Review (1971) 90 pp.	Gratis
72-18	Stimulus and Response: Sixth Annual Review (1972) 80 pp.	Gratis
76-1	New Structure, New Environment: Review 1972-73 to 1974-75 (1976) 78 pp.	Gratis
78-17	An Uncertain Future: Review 1975-76 to 1977-78 (1978) 59 pp.	Gratis
82-9	Squeezing the Triangle: Review 1978-79 to 1981-82 (1982) 54 pp.	Gratis
	Other Publications	
62-1	Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, 1962-70 (1962) 44 pp.	$ 1.00
63-1	The Structure of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario (1963) 30 pp.	$ 1.50
66-1	From the Sixties to the Seventies: An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario (1966) 101 pp.	$ 2.00
70-4	Ring of Iron: A Study of Engineering Education in Ontario (1970) 154 pp.	$ 2.00
70-19	Television and Technology in University Teaching (1970) 84 pp.	Gratis
71-7	Financing University Programs in Education (1971) 76 pp.	Gratis
71-9C	Towards 2000 (published by McClelland and Stewart) (1971) 176 pp.	$ 6.95
71-10	Accessibility and Student Aid (1971) 150 pp.	$ 2.50
71-13	Statement by the Council of Ontario Universities and Responses by Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering, Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario to *Ring of Iron: A Study of Engineering Education in Ontario* (1971) 98 pp.	$ 1.00
72-7	Responses to the *Draft Report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario* (1972) 45 pp.	Gratis

Number	*Title*	*Price*
72-8	"The Ten O'Clock Scholar?" What a Professor Does for his Pay (1972) 14 pp.	Gratis
72-9	Building Blocks: Background Studies on the Development of a Capital Formula for Ontario Vol. 1: Report of the Task Force - Space and Utilization (1972) 186 pp.	$ 6.00
72-10	Building Blocks: Vol. III: Report of the Task Force - Space for Health Sciences (1972) 72 pp.	$ 3.00
72-11	Building Blocks: Vol. II: Report of the Task Force - Space for Education (1972) 48 pp.	$ 2.00
72-12	Building Blocks: Vol. IV: Report of the Task Force - Building Costs (1972) 86 pp.	$ 3.00
73-1	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 1: Library Science 1972 (1973) 169 pp.	$ 5.00
73-4	Response to the Report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario (1973) 28 pp.	Gratis
74-1	Building Blocks: Vol. V: Report of the Task Force - Building Life Costs (1974) 144 pp.	$ 5.00
74-2	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 2. Education 1973 (1974) 179 pp.	$ 5.00
74-3	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 3. Economics 1973 (1974) 197 pp.	$ 5.00
74-4	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 4. Geography 1973 (1974) 131 pp.	$ 5.00
74-5	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 5. Chemistry 1973 (1974) 168 pp.	$ 5.00
74-6	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 6. Solid Earth Science 1973 (1974) 161 pp.	$ 5.00
74-8	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 7. Sociology 1973 (1974) 215 pp.	$ 5.00
74-9	The Ontario Operating Grants Formula: A Statement of Principles to the Ontario Council on University Affairs (1974) 51 pp.	Gratis
74-10	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 8. Anthropology 1974 (1974) 71 pp.	$ 3.00
74-11	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 9. Political Science 1974 (1974) 269 pp.	$ 5.00
74-12	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 10. Physical Education, Kinesiology, and Related Areas 1974 (1974) 160 pp.	$ 5.00
74-13	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11A Chemical Engineering 1974 (1974) 221 pp.	$ 5.00
74-14	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11B. Electrical Engineering 1974 (1974) 259 pp.	$ 5.00

Number	*Title*	*Price*
74-15	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11C Metallurgical and Materials Engineering 1974 (1974) 213 pp.	$ 5.00
74-16	Ontario Universities' Application Centre: The First Three Years 1971-74 (1974) 47 pp.	Gratis
74-21	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11D. Mechanical Engineering 1974 (1974) 133 pp.	$ 5.00
74-22	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11E Industrial Engineering and Systems Design 1974 (1974) 152 pp.	$ 5.00
74-23	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 12. Religious Studies 1974 (1974) 106 pp.	$ 5.00
74-24	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 13. Planning and Environmental Studies 1974 (1974) 144 pp.	$ 5.00
75-1	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 14. Physics and Astronomy 1974 (1975) 224 pp.	$ 5.00
75-2	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 15. History 1974 (1975) 208 pp.	$ 5.00
75-5	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 16. Biophysics 1974 (1975) 47 pp.	$ 3.00
75-10	Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development (1975) 89 pp.	$ 3.50
75-11	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11F. Civil Engineering 1974-75 (1975) 304 pp.	$ 8.00
75-13	UNICAT/TELECAT: A Report of the Cooperative Use of a Computer-Based Cataloguing Support System (1975) 202 pp.	$10.00
76-5	Brief to the Canadian and Ontario Governments on the Financing of Higher Education in Canada (1976) 24 pp.	Gratis
76-9	Approach to the Eighties: Demand/Quality/Resources. Brief to OCUA (1976) 59 pp.	Gratis
76-14	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 17. Administration, Business and Management Science 1974 (1976) 143 pp.	$ 5.00
76-15	Commoditie, Firmenes and Delight: A Study of Architectural Education in Ontario (1976) 352 pp.	$10.00
76-18	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 18. Fine Arts 1974-76 (1976) 204 pp.	$ 5.00
77-1	Foundation for an Uncertain Future: The Operating Base. Brief to OCUA (1977) 54 pp.	Gratis
77-2	Foundation for an Uncertain Future: The Capital Base. Brief to OCUA (1977) 22 pp.	Gratis
77-5	Constructive Partnership: A University Perspective. The Report from the Special Committee on the Interface Study (1977) 60 pp.	Gratis

Number	*Title*	*Price*
77-6	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 19. Mathematical Sciences 1975 (1977) 196 pp.	$ 5.00
77-8	Guide to Accounting Principles. Practices and Standards of Disclosure for Colleges and Universities of Ontario (1977) 41 pp.	$20.00
78-1	The Price of Restraint. Brief to OCUA (1978) 61 pp.	Gratis
78-2	Realignment of Priorities for Teacher Education: A Status Report on the Ontario Faculties of Education (1978) 57 pp.	Gratis
78-3	Ontario University Non-Salary Price Index (1978) 20 pp.	$ 3.00
78-6	Graduate Planning in Ontario Universities. Brief to OCUA (1978) 36 pp.	Gratis
78-9	Report of a Study of Ontario Medical School Admissions Policies and Practices 1975 (1978) 67 pp.	$ 3.00
78-12	Building Blocks: Vol. VI: Report of the Subcommittee - Revisions to Building Blocks (1978) 122 pp.	$ 5.00
78-16	An Approach to the Funding of Continuing Education for Teachers. A Supplement to: *Realignment of Priorities for Teacher Education* (1978) 17 pp.	Gratis
79-2	Who Pays the Price? Brief to OCUA (1979) 62 pp.	Gratis
79-3	Graduate Student Incomes in Ontario 1977-78 (1979) 30 pp.	Gratis
79-4	Citizenship of Students and Faculty in Canadian Universities: A Statistical Report. (1979) 131 pp.	Gratis
79-5	Council of Ontario Universities. Experimental Achievement Testing Programme. Summary Report. (1979) 137 pp.	$ 7.50
79-9	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 20. Psychology 1977. (1979) 200 pp.	$10.00
80-2	Changing Public Priorities: Universities and the Future of Ontario. Brief to OCUA (1980) 69 pp.	Gratis
81-1	A Future of Lost Opportunities? Brief to OCUA (1981) 68 pp.	Gratis
81-2	Operating Fund Net Change in Appropriated Reserves and Unappropriated Funds for the Fiscal Year ended April 30, 1980. (Addendum to 80-4) (1981) 51 pp.	$ 2.00
81-5	Universities and the Future of Ontario: A Foundation on Which to Build (1981) 48 pp.	Gratis
81-8	Survey on Diagnostic Achievement Testing: Report of Findings (1981) 32 pp.	Gratis
82-1	Federal Provincial Relations and Support for Universities (1982) 83 pp.	$ 2.50 for multiple copies
82-2	A Brief in Response to the Report of the Secondary Education Review Project (1982) 22 pp.	Gratis

Number	*Title*	*Price*
82-3	Once More, With Feeling. Brief to OCUA (1982) 58 pp.	Gratis
82-4	UNICAT/TELECAT: A Final Report (1982) 71 pp.	$ 5.00
82-8	Report of the Task Force on Medical Manpower (1982) 94 pp.	$ 5.00
83-1	Brief to the Ontario Council on University Affairs on Operating Grant Requirements for 1984-85. Prepared by the COU Committee on Operating Grants (1983) 51 pp.	Gratis
83-1S	Supplementary Brief. University Revenue Requirements for 1984-85 (1983) 8 pp.	Gratis
83-3	A Review of Distance Education in Ontario Universities (1983) 148 pp.	$ 6.50
83-4	Cooperation Among Ontario University Libraries by Bruce Peel and William J. Kurmey (1983) 62 pp.	$ 3.00
83-7	The Ontario Test of English Achievement. The Final Report On Its Development (1983) 33 pp.	$ 2.00
83-8	Participation Rates & Future Enrolment in Ontario Universities. Prepared by the Committee on Enrolment Statistics and Projections (1983) 64 pp.	$ 3.50 for multiple copies
84-4	Brief to the Ontario Council on University Affairs on Operating Grants Requirements for 1985-86. Prepared by the COU Committee on Operating Grants (1984) 56 pp.	Gratis
84-5	Inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities 1983-84 (1984) 89 pp.	Gratis
84-7	Continuity and Renewal: The Demands of Excellence. A Response to the Discussion Paper of the Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario (1984) 155 pp.	$ 7.00 for multiple copies
85-6	Financial Report of Ontario Universities 1984-85 (1985) 3 volumes	$25.00
85-7	Accessibility to Ontario Universities Fall 1984 (1985) 70 pp.	$ 3.50
85-8	University Benefits Survey: Part 1 (All Benefits Excluding Pensions) (1985) 78 pp.	$ 3.00
85-9	University Benefits Survey: Part 2 (Pensions) (1985) 44 pp.	$ 3.00
86-1	Ontario Universities Statistical Compendium 1970-71 to 1984-85 (1986) Part A 56 pp., Part B 8 pp.	$4.50, $1.50
86-2	Financial Position of Universities in Ontario (1986) 50 pp.	Gratis
86-3	Inventory of Health Research Activities in Ontario Universities 1983-84 (1986) 122 pp.	
86-4	Application Statistics 1985 (1986) 22 pp.	Gratis

Reports and Papers Prepared by Members of COU Staff, Committees and Affiliates

Number	*Title*	*Price*
January, 1979	Public Image Report	Gratis
January, 1980	The University Graduate and the Marketplace by L. Selleck.	$ 2.00
June, 1980	Special Committee to Review Graduate Planning. Discussion Paper.	$ 3.25
Fall, 1980	Equality of Access to Ontario Universities by L. Selleck.	$ 2.00
June, 1981	Critique of *Job Market Reality for Postsecondary Graduates* (by W. Clark and Z. Zsigmond) by L. Selleck.	Gratis
May, 1982	Research papers prepared in connection with the Report of the Task Force on Medical Manpower, Publ. No. 82-8	
	Planning or Simply Supply Projections? A Critical Review of Physician Manpower Forecasting in Canada.	$ 3.00
	Estimates of the Potential Impact of Nurse Practitioners on Future Requirements for General Practitioners.	$ 2.00
	Physician Manpower Under Competing Health Plans: Where We Could Be, Where We Are and Issues in Getting From Here to There.	$ 3.00
June, 1982	Manpower Planning and Higher Education Policy by L. Selleck.	Gratis
November, 1983	The Labour Market Impacts of High Technology: Implications for the Universities by L. Selleck.	Gratis

Council also has an occasional publication entitled "Briefing Notes". Some 25 issues have appeared to date.